

Annual Idaho Performance Report 2013

Idaho State Department of Education

Division of Special Education

149 district/agencies in Idaho serving students with disabilities – 151 projected beginning September 2013

2012 27,098 students with disabilities

2011 281,854 students enrolled in Idaho public schools

26,864 students with disabilities (9.5%)

8.3% school age (ages 6-21)

2010 281,675 students enrolled in Idaho public schools

Idaho reports annually in February to the public on the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" in the following areas ("Indicators"):

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1: Graduation Rate * | 11: Initial Eligibility 60 day Timeline |
| 2: Dropout Rate * | 12: Early Childhood Transition |
| 3: AYP and ISAT | 13: Secondary Transition |
| 4: Suspensions and Expulsions | 14: Post School Outcomes * |
| 5: Ed Environment ages 6-21 | 15: Monitoring Correction of Compliance |
| 6: Ed Environment ages 3-5 | 16: Complaints |
| 7: Early Child Outcomes | 17: Hearings |
| 8: Parent Involvement * | 18: Resolution Sessions |
| 9: Disproportionality in Special Ed | 19: Mediation |
| 10: Disproportionality by Disability | 20: Timely and Accurate Reporting |

*Information contained

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Generating a graduation rate for all subgroups under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires collaboration between three SDE divisions: Information Technology, Public School Finance, and Special Education. Public School Finance collects data with the assistance of Information Technology. Special Education assists in ensuring the data are clean by comparing it to special education data sources and resolving differences with districts reporting conflicting data in Attendance and Enrollment compared to Child Count or Exiting Data. Information Technology uses the clean data to generate graduation rates for all subgroups for reporting under ESEA.

The Special Education Advisory Panel was provided with the data and provided feedback on the State Plan, priorities, activities, and targets.

A monitoring workgroup comprised of District special education directors from both charter and traditional school districts met three times during the year to review data, processes and procedures, and to provide input for improvement and additional training needs.

The SDE continues to solicit suggestions, and insights from these groups were extremely valuable to the development of the SPP/APR.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

ESEA formula for graduation in Idaho: [(number of graduates), divided by the (number of graduates plus the number of dropouts from the cohort group over the four years of high school)]. This same formula applies to all students and subgroups, including students with disabilities.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for FFY 2011
2011	90%	87.3%

Data Source: Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Special Education Graduates		Cohort Dropouts	
2010-2011 Graduates	662	Grade 12	34
		Grade 11	20
		Grade 10	22
		Grade 9	20
		Total Dropouts	96
Graduation Rate = $[662/(662+96)] = 87.3\%$			

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Four-Year Comparison of Graduation Rates

FFY	Graduation Rate
2007	81.4%
2008	76.7%
2009	88.8%
2010	89.2%
2011	87.3%

Data are reported from every district for the 2010-2011 school year. The target of 90% is the same annual graduation rate target under Title I of the ESEA for all subgroups, including students with an IEP.

Graduation rates are one piece of data that Districts must respond to in writing with their school and district improvement plans. During the self-assessment process, Districts must look for root causes of poor performance on this indicator and plan activities to improve their graduation rate for students with disabilities, if they failed to meet the rigorous goal. They may review and revise the improvement plan annually, as needed, based on their performance data.

Conditions all Idaho youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma:

The conditions that Idaho youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma (for students who enter high school at the 9th grade level in Fall 2009 or later) include 29 credits for core instruction, 17 credits for electives, a Postsecondary Readiness Plan completed at the end of 8th grade, and a score of proficient or advanced in reading, math, and language usage on the Idaho State Achievement Test. In addition, Idaho allows for an alternate mechanism, to be used for all students, if they do not achieve a score of proficient or advanced in reading, math, and language usage, however, they must follow an appeal procedure in their local school district. The alternate mechanism or alternate pathway must meet IDAPA Rules Governing Thoroughness 08.02.03 in which 90% of the criteria of the measure(s) must be based on academic proficiency and performance, the measure(s) must be aligned to a minimum of 10th grade content standards and aligned to subject matter, and the measure(s) must be valid and reliable. For students with disabilities on IEPs, in order to meet their individual needs to demonstrate achievement, if accommodations or adaptations are made to the District and State's regular graduation requirement, including the Idaho State Achievement Test, the IEP team shall document them in the IEP.

College Entrance Exam:

A student must take one (1) of the following college entrance examinations before the end of the student's eleventh grade year: COMPASS, ACCUPLACER, ACT or SAT.

Senior Project:

A student must complete a senior project by the end of grade twelve (12).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Slippage: Idaho's actual target data for the graduation rate for students with disabilities is 87.3%, down from 89.2% the prior year, and Idaho did not reach the rigorous ESEA target of 90%. Idaho has been without a lead position to address all issues concerning high school completion. The SDE has established a new director position to address student engagement and post-secondary readiness. This director will

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

work with ESEA and SPED divisions to target technical assistance for districts with greatest needs. Additional improvement activities, as described below, are also being added to help meet the SDE targets.

The SDE has seven regional coordinators assisting districts with instructional and compliance issues. The regional coordinators provided 45 districts with technical assistance specific to retention and graduation in FFY 2011.

Not captured in the data are the increasing numbers of students (approximately 1.5% in the 2010-2011 SY compared to 1.4% in 2009-2010) staying in the secondary education system into their fifth, sixth, and seventh years of high school to continue with special education programs and work towards a diploma.

In a continued partnership with Boise State University Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies (CSI&PS), the SDE provides technical assistance to districts & schools classified in one of the stages of Needs Improvement, as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act. Technical assistance to these districts & schools includes the provision and coordination of professional development; fostering collaboration; and the enhancement of regional, district, and school capacities to better serve students.

The SDE continues to use the Ways to Improve School Effectiveness (WISE) Tool to assist LEAs improve services to all students and improve graduation rates. The WISE Tool has many support features built into the tool that provides schools and districts with best practice research linked to the areas used for planning.

FFY	Improvement Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	Collaborate with the AT (Assistive Technology) Project to offer the "Tools for Life Conference" for high school students with disabilities	March 2012	Tools for Life number of attendees: 320 (33 educators, 124 students, 52 family members, 79 professionals, 11 vendors, 13 college mentors, 8 self-advocate adults) Tools for Life had 13 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about self-determination. Tools for Life had 5 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about self-advocacy. Tools for Life had 7 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about community living. Tools for Life had 11 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about employment. Tools for Life had 11 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about postsecondary education and assistive technology.
2011	Sponsor the Youth Leadership Forum to develop leadership abilities of SWD and encourage them to take an active role in community leadership	Discontinued	Youth Leadership Forum was not provided because of the lack of funding and manpower needed to support the forum. The forum only provides participation to a small number of students.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Dropout rates are reported annually to school districts. In their monitoring self-assessment process, they must explore the root cause of dropout rates that fail to meet the state goal and write an improvement plan to address the underlying issues. These plans may be revised annually, as needed, based on new data.

Input is gathered from a variety of stakeholders. The Special Education Advisory Panel, including a wide array of stakeholders, receives a presentation and report on all indicators in the Fall meeting. Discussion and input follows. A Special Education Workgroup meets at least twice a year to consider data for the indicators and provide input and recommendations. Data are presented at standing conferences such as Idaho Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Special Education Directors Conference, Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA) Annual Conferences, Idaho Association of Secondary School Principals (IASSP) and as many others as possible, with broad stakeholder input solicited. Recommendations are taken into consideration as improvement planning occurs.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source and Measurement:

Per OSEP memo 13-6 in the APR writing packet, Idaho has chosen the option to report indicator 2 "using the same data source and measurement that the State used for its FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012 ESEA dropout event rate: [(number of (special education) students enrolled in grades 9-12 who dropped out) [96, divided by the (total number of (special education) students enrolled in grades 9-12) [6507] times 100].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for FFY 2011
2011 (SY 2010-2011 data)	2.1%	1.5%

4-Year Comparison of Dropout Rates

FFY	Number of Dropouts	Number of SWD in Grades 9-12	Dropout Rate
2007	184	7,059	2.6%
2008	152	6,710	2.3%
2009	94	6,870	1.4%
2010	83	6,866	1.2%
2011	96	6,507	1.5%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Data were reported from every school and district for the 2010-2011 school year. Validation checks were implemented and curious data resolved.

Definition of a dropout:

The same definition for a dropout is used for all Idaho youth, including students with disabilities on IEPs. A dropout is an individual who was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year, and who does **not** meet any of the following conditions:

- Graduation from high school or completion of a State or District approved educational program, or
- Transfer to another public school district, private school, or State or District approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs), or
- Temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness, or
- Death.

Explanation of Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Slippage: At 1.5%, Idaho's dropout rate increased by 0.3% over the previous year's data of 1.2%. Even with slippage, the rigorous target of less than 2.1% was met. The SDE continues to provide technical assistance to districts through webinars and collaboration between the secondary special education coordinator, district special education directors, School Improvement, and Gear Up programs. Additionally, the SDE has established a new director position to address student engagement and post-secondary readiness. This director will work with ESEA and SPED divisions to target technical assistance for districts with greatest needs.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	Collaborate with general education data specialists and Computer Services to use the longitudinal data system to track a specific student's enrollment, dropout, or graduation status for reporting dropouts for ESEA.	Ongoing	The Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator have been assisting the general education data specialists and Computer Services to improve on the exit data school districts are uploading to the state data management system. Updates were added to the ISSE system and monitoring continues.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

$$36\% = (126/349) * 100$$

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The SDE contracted with Piedra Data Services to develop and distribute the Parent Participation Survey. Analysis of the data was completed by Dr. Penfield. The survey consisted of a 25-item rating scale, the Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS), developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). One survey is used for all respondents from preschool through grade 12. The 25 questions were displayed in English on the front and in Spanish on the back of the page. Demographic items addressing the student's race/ethnicity, grade, and primary exceptionality were also included. A total of 2,581 surveys were distributed to a representative sample of parents of students with disabilities in 14 school districts in Year 5 of the OSEP approved sampling plan outlined in the SPP. Of these, 349 (13.52%) were returned. The SDE noted a significant drop in returned surveys by parents of preschool age students. The number of returned surveys exceeds the minimum number required for an adequate confidence level based on established survey sample guidelines (e.g., <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>). The data set submitted for analysis contained no personally identifiable information on the respondents.

Data from the rating scale were analyzed through the Rasch measurement framework. The analysis produces a measure on a scale from zero to 1,000 for each survey respondent. Each measure reflects the extent to which the parent indicated that schools facilitated that parent's involvement. The measures of all respondents were averaged to yield a mean measure reflecting the overall performance of the State of Idaho in regard to schools' facilitation of parent involvement.

OSEP requires that states' performance be reported as the *percent* of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement. Deriving a percent from a continuous distribution requires application of a standard, or cut-score. The Idaho SDE elected to apply the standard recommended by a nationally representative stakeholder group convened by NCSEAM. The recommended standard, established based on item content expressed in the scale, was operationalized as a measure of 600. Thus, the percent of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement was calculated as the percent of parents with a measure of 600 or above on the SEPPS.

Below are the survey questions in the order they would be ranked if the parent agreed or strongly agreed with each statement. As you can see, a score of 600 is a very high standard. A parent would have to agree

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

with almost every statement in order to hit the "Gold Standard" of 600. 36% of parents who responded did score their district at or above the Gold Standard.

Score	Parent Survey Questions (SEPPS)
672	I was given information about options my child will have after high school.
653	The school offers parents training about special education issues.
647	I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.
634	The school provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school.
600 Gold Standard	The school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.
591	I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs.
581	The school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.
573	Written justification was given for the extent that my child would not receive services in the regular classroom.
570	The school gives me choices with regard to services that address my child's needs.
564	At the IEP meeting, we discussed how my child would participate in statewide assessments.
561	The school offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers.
550	The school communicates regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals.
544	Teachers and administrators seek out parent input.
533	Teachers and administrators show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities and their families.
528	Teachers and administrators ensure that I have fully understood the Procedural Safeguards [the rules in federal law that protect the rights of parents].
526	Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.
523	The school has a person on staff that is available to answer parents' questions.
513	All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP.
511	Teachers treat me as a team member.
507	I am considered an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program.
505	My child's evaluation report is written in terms I understand.
505	Written information I receive is written in an understandable way.
504	Teachers and administrators respect my cultural heritage.
492	Teachers are available to speak with me.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

490	At the IEP meeting, we discussed accommodations and modifications that my child would need.
-----	---

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for FFY 2011
2011	32%	36%

Parent Survey Statistics for 2011-2012	
Number of surveys mailed to parents with children with disabilities attending districts in the Year-4 sample (refer to sampling plan in SPP).	2,581
Completed Surveys Returned	349
Return rate	13.52%
Number of respondent parents surveyed who scored schools at or above the gold standard of 600 when rating schools' facilitation of parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	126
Percent of respondent parents surveyed who scored schools higher than the gold standard of 600 when rating schools' facilitation of parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	36%

Four-Year Comparison

FFY	Target	Actual Target Performance
2006	Baseline 27%	26%
2007	28%	25%
2008	29%	35%
2009	30%	33%
2010	31%	34%
2011	32%	36%

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

Measurable and Rigorous Targets	2011
14.A. Enrolled in higher education within one year	18.3%
14.B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year	37.0%
14.C. Enrolled in higher education, other postsecondary education or training, competitively employed, or in some other employment within one year	71.1%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Actual Target Data for 2011:

Measurable and Rigorous Targets	2011
14.A. Enrolled in higher education within one year	19%
14.B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year	32%
14.C. Enrolled in higher education, other postsecondary education or training, competitively employed, or in some other employment within one year	75%

One year after students left school, including those who graduated, dropped out, or aged out, 71.1% were engaged in either post-secondary education or employment. Data is collected through a contractor, LifeTrack Services Inc., with initial contact made by the SDE through an introduction letter and written survey. To ensure a high response rate the contractor follows up with one additional written contact by mail. If a response is not received, a phone interview is conducted. The interviewer will attempt to contact the student up to three times by phone to conduct the interview. Responses are considered valid if reported by the student or the parent of the student.

Data taken for leavers during the 2010-2011 school year (481 Surveys)	#	%
1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (should be same as 14A)	88	18.3%
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education)	90	18.7%
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	57	12.1%
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed)	107	22.2%
Total Engaged	342	71.1%

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Idaho conducts a census survey of all leavers one year after exiting high school. Every district is included every year. This includes both graduates and dropouts, including those who age out without graduating. In addition to this requirement, Idaho began surveying exiting students beginning with the Class of 2000 and is continuing to survey exiting students prior to departure, as well as one year and three years after exiting. Prior to exiting, an online survey is taken at the high school. Post exit surveys are contracted with LifeTrack Services Inc. The State provides contact information and LifeTrack follows up by mailing surveys and making up to three phone calls in an effort to contact non-responders or their parents to complete the survey by phone. The overall response rate is 54.8% as noted in the table below. The 832 targeted leavers were students who aged out, graduated or dropped out. Overall, the number of targeted leavers was less in this year's sample due to the original organization of cohort districts. Respondents are representative of completers and dropouts.

Ada County Juvenile Detention Center
Boys' Classroom (ages 10 – 17)

2009 - 2010 school year (excluding summer school)

had 179 different boys

64 of those had IEP's (36%)

27 ED

14 Health Impaired

9 LD

1 TBI

1 Language Impairment

1 Speech

2 Autism

3 Cognitive Impairment

4 with 504s

2 ELL

2010 - 2011 school year

had 243 different students

69 of those had IEP's (28%)

34 ED

11 Health Impaired

2 Autism

6 Language Impairment

9 L.D.

3 Cognitive Impairment

15 with 504s

5 ELL

2011 - 2012 school year

had 205 different students

48 of those had IEP's (23%)

27 ED

12 Health Impaired

of these 4 had ADHD, 1 unknown, and 7 ADHD plus either bi-polar, mood disorder, depression or PTSD

2 Cognitive Impairment

4 Language Impairment

1 Autism

2 LD

12 with 504's

2 ELL